

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Accenture Global Services Limited v. singor longor  
Case No. D2025-2517

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Accenture Global Services Limited, Ireland, represented by McDermott Will & Emery LLP, United States of America (“United States”).

The Respondent is singor longor, Egypt.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <accentureai.net> is registered with MainReg Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 26, 2025. On June 26, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 27, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Domain Admin / Whois protection, this company does not own this domain name s.r.o.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 23, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on July 25, 2025. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 25, 2025.<sup>1</sup>

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with paragraphs 2 and 4 of the Rules, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 8, 2025. In accordance with paragraph 5 of the

---

<sup>1</sup>The Complainant has removed two domain names from the proceeding upon receiving the Center’s notice of multiple underlying registrants.

Rules, the due date for Response was August 28, 2025. The Respondent did not file any formal response. Accordingly, the Center notified the commencement of the panel appointment process on September 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Yuji Yamaguchi as the sole panelist in this matter on September 12, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with paragraph 7 of the Rules.

#### **4. Factual Background**

The Complainant is an international business that provides a broad range of services and solutions in strategy, consulting, digital, technology, and operations. The Complainant has offices and operations in more than 200 cities in 49 countries.

The Complainant began using the ACCENTURE trademark and company name, and marks fully incorporating the ACCENTURE trademark (collectively the "ACCENTURE Marks") on January 1, 2001, and continues to use the ACCENTURE Marks in connection with various services, including management consulting, technology services, outsourcing services, and services pertaining to generative artificial intelligence ("AI"). The Complainant owns more than 1,000 registrations for the ACCENTURE Marks in more than 140 jurisdictions, including United States Trademark Registrations Nos. 2,665,373 (registered on December 24, 2002), 2,884,125 (registered on September 14, 2004), 3,091,811 (registered on May 16, 2006), 3,340,780 (registered on November 20, 2007), 7,258,092 (registered on January 2, 2024), 7,258,093 (registered on January 2, 2024), and 7,266,256 (registered on January 9, 2024).

On August 29, 2000, the Complainant registered the domain name <accenture.com>, at which the Complainant operates its website.

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on June 5, 2025 and currently does not resolve to an active website.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant's contentions may be summarized as follows:

In both sight and sound, the disputed domain name is nearly identical and confusingly similar to the Complainant's famous ACCENTURE Mark. The disputed domain name is comprised of the full ACCENTURE Mark paired with the letters "ai," which suggests a reference to "artificial intelligence" and the Complainant's AI service offerings. The ACCENTURE Mark consists of a coined term and, as such, should be afforded a wide scope of protection, particularly in view of the ubiquitous nature of the brand (as demonstrated by the heavy advertising presence worldwide).

The Respondent is neither affiliated with, nor licensed or permitted to use the Complainant's ACCENTURE Marks or any domain name incorporating the ACCENTURE Mark by the Complainant. The Complainant's ACCENTURE Mark is not a generic or descriptive term in which the Respondent might have an interest. The Complainant's ACCENTURE Marks are globally famous and have acquired secondary meaning through the Complainant's substantial, continuous, and exclusive use of the ACCENTURE Marks in connection with the Complainant's goods and services. The disputed domain name results in an Internet browser security

warning that the site has been “blocked due to a security threat.” As such, the disputed domain name appears to be in use for purposes that could harm a visitor to the resulting website. The use of the disputed domain name for malicious web attack or malware purposes in no way confers on the Respondent any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Given the Complainant’s worldwide reputation and the ubiquitous presence of the ACCENTURE Marks on the Internet, and in view of the Respondent’s use of the Complainant’s famous ACCENTURE Mark in the disputed domain name, the Respondent clearly was aware of the ACCENTURE Marks prior to registering the disputed domain name. The use of the disputed domain name for any purpose associated with a security risk is clear evidence of bad faith use and registration of the disputed domain name. Given the well-known status of the Complainant’s ACCENTURE Marks, there is no reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name other than to trade off of the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant’s ACCENTURE Marks.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent’s contentions in the email communication are as follows:

At the time of registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent was not aware of the existence of a company named Accenture or any registered trademarks related to that name.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name with good faith and had no intention to mislead, compete with, or take advantage of any existing brand or trademark.

The disputed domain name was never used for any website, email, or service. It has remained inactive since registration.

The Respondent has already taken action and disabled the disputed domain name.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must assert and prove the following three elements are present:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

It is well accepted that the first element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name. See section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)).

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. See section 1.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s ACCENTURE Mark in its entirety with the addition of two letters “ai” plus a generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.net”, which is viewed as a standard

registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

As section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) states, where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the mere addition of other terms, whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise, would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. Although the addition of other terms here, the letters “ai”, which are an abbreviation for “artificial intelligence”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s ACCENTURE Mark for the purposes of the Policy (see *Accenture Global Services Limited v. Benjamin Sunder, summitskin*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2097](#)).

Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s ACCENTURE Mark and the first element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

As the Complainant asserts, the Respondent is neither affiliated with, nor licensed or permitted to use the Complainant’s ACCENTURE Marks or any domain name incorporating the ACCENTURE Mark by the Complainant. There is no evidence to show that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The Respondent admits that the disputed domain name was never used for any website, email, or service, but the Respondent asserts neither demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services nor legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraphs 4(c)(i) and (iii) of the Policy.

Although the overall burden of proof in the proceedings is on the complainant, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on the second element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. See section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. Moreover, the Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. See section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and the second element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Complainant has established the Complainant’s global reputation and goodwill in its ACCENTURE Marks. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name over 20 years after the Complainant first registered its ACCENTURE Mark in the United States. Although the Respondent asserts that the Respondent was not aware of the existence of the Complainant at the time of registering the disputed

domain name, the Panel considers that the Respondent knew or must have known the Complainant and its ACCENTURE Marks when the Respondent has deliberately chosen and registered the disputed domain name that incorporates the Complainant's ACCENTURE Mark in its entirety together with the additional term "ai" referring to the services offered by the Complainant.

According to the Complainant's assertion, the site to which the disputed domain name resolved has been "blocked due to a security threat". The security alert page shows that the site was classified to the categories: "Enterprise Malware, Phishing". The registration and use of the disputed domain name for malware or phishing purposes constitute bad faith. See sections 3.1.4 and 3.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The fact that the disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive site and is not being used does not prevent a finding of bad faith in this case under the doctrine of passive holding, in consideration of (i) the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's ACCENTURE Marks, (ii) the failure of the Respondent to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the Respondent's provision of faulty or incomplete contact details when registering the disputed domain name (the courier service was not able to deliver the Center's Written Notice), and (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put taking into account the composition of the disputed domain name. See section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

In conclusion, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith and the third element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

## **7. Decision**

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <accentureai.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Yuji Yamaguchi/*

**Yuji Yamaguchi**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 26, 2025